



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT CAPACITY BUILDING

IN BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS, MALI

FINAL REPORT

**November 2006**

This report is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of International Resources Group (IRG) and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.



# ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT CAPACITY BUILDING

IN BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS, MALI

FINAL REPORT



**International Resources Group**

1211 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC 20036

202-289-0100 Fax 202-289-7601

[www.irgltd.com](http://www.irgltd.com)



# CONTENTS

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Program Description.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Task 1: Development and Delivery of Training Courses.....	2
Task 2: Recommendations for Improving GRM EIA Processes and Analysis of Options for the Initiation of an Environmental Management Fund Study.....	3
Task 3: Development and Delivery of Mentoring Program .....	4
<b>Program Results and Evaluation.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Task 1: Development and Delivery of Training Courses.....	5
Task 2: Recommendations for Improving GRM EIA Processes and Analysis of Options for the Initiation of an Environmental Management Fund Study.....	6
Task 3: Development and Delivery of Mentoring Program .....	8
<b>Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Annex I: List of Participants .....</b>	<b>11</b>



# INTRODUCTION

USAID Mali initiated this project with the goal of working with the Malian Ministry of the Environment (MEA) and the US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) to increase Malian capacity to address environmental issues in development and to utilize environmental impact assessment as a strategic tool for sustainable development, consistent with the declared policy of the government of Mali.

This project was designed to deliver an integrated program that builds Malian capacity to make informed decisions; improve stakeholder, public and governmental involvement; mitigate the adverse environmental, social and economic impacts of projects; and monitor and enforce conditions for approval. The project included three complementary components:

1. Training: a series of seven training activities were conducted.
2. Research: an assessment was conducted of options for improving Mali's EIA system and for creating an environmental financing mechanism to support the EIA system and potentially environmental management activities more generally.
3. Mentoring: a mentoring program allowed US EPA staff to work with the Malian Ministry of the Environment.

Each of the program components is described in greater detail in section II below.

# PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

## TASK 1: DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF TRAINING COURSES

A series of five courses, a training of trainers, and one half day module on biotechnology and biosafety were offered over the course of project, for a total of seven activities.

The courses, their origin and the training team for each are outlined in the table below:

Course	Module number	Development/origin	Training team
Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment	1	US EPA	US EPA
Environmental Impact Assessment Field Practicum	2	Based on the ENCAP EA-ESDM course, adapted for Mali	The Cadmus Group, IRG
Biotechnology and Bio-safety	2	IRG	IRG
Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment Review	3	US EPA	US EPA
Training of Trainers	3	US EPA	US EPA
Elements of Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training	4	US EPA	US EPA
Cleaner Production for Small and Medium Enterprises	5	The Cadmus Group with support from USAID/ENCAP	The Cadmus Group, DevTech and IRG

All courses received logistical support and substantive inputs from the project's in-country Malian team.

A half-day introductory module was also included to introduce participants to issues related to biotechnology and biosafety. In addition, a one-day Training of Trainers was held in conjunction with the Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment Review course.

Modules 1 and 2, Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment and the Environmental Impact Assessment Field Practicum were held in a single training session, along with a third component providing an introduction to issues related to biotechnology and biosafety. These courses were held June 21-26, 2005. Twenty four environmental officials representing national and regional government, and the private sector participated in the courses.

Module 3, Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment Review, was held February 27 to March 2, 2006. Twenty-five environmental officials representing national and regional government and the private sector were invited to participate. Many of the participants from Modules 1 and 2 also participated in Module 3. The course used case-study exercises to introduce students to fundamental elements involved in reviewing EIAs. The Training of Trainers course was held on March 3, 2006. Ten participants were selected by the US EPA and the MEA as having the potential for being successful facilitators. Participants learned how to train independent government reviewers of Environmental Impact Assessments in how to effectively carry out their role in the EIA process.

Module 4, Principles of Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training, was held July 24-26, 2006. Twenty-two participants representing national and regional government agencies, NGOs and the private sector participated in the course. The course provided participants with a framework and principles for understanding how regulatory agencies may design and establish environmental requirements and implement them through compliance promotion, economic incentives, and enforcement programs.



Module 5, Cleaner Production for Small and Medium Enterprises, was held from April 24-27, 2006. Designed primarily for organizations and institutions providing business development services and financing to small and medium enterprises, the course emphasized improving business operations and profitability through the application of cleaner production principles. Twenty-seven participants representing the Malian Ministries of the Environment and Agriculture, small business owners and associates, and the NGO community attended the course.

## **TASK 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING GRM EIA PROCESSES AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS FOR THE INITIATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT FUND STUDY**

A second component of this project involved organizing a study team to assess options for improving Mali's EIA system and for creating an environmental financing mechanism to support the EIA system and, potentially, environmental management activities more generally. The principal deliverable under this task was the report titled "Improving the EIA System and the Funding of Environmental Management in Mali".

To complete this component, a team of six EIA and environmental fund experts was assembled including: the team leader, Patrick Francis (Equilibrium Consultants); Mark Stoughton (The Cadmus Group); two Malian EIA experts and independent consultants, Seydou Keita and Seydou Bouare; and two Malagasy experts, Josoa Razafindretsa (USAID/Madagascar) and Jean Chysostome Rakotoary (Office National de l'Environnement, Madagascar).

In the planning stages for this assessment, it was determined that the experience of Madagascar was particularly relevant to Mali. Over the past decade, the Government of Madagascar—with financial and technical supports from USAID—has succeeded in developing the policy and regulatory framework for EIA. Discussions between USAID/Mali, USAID/Madagascar, and USAID/AFR/SD resulted in the participation of Mr. Razafindretsa, a USAID/Madagascar program officer who has been deeply involved in this EIA capacity-building effort, and Mr. Rakotoary, Director-General of Madagascar's Office National de l'Environnement, an independent agency charged with implementation of Madagascar's EIA system.

Mr. Razafindretsa's participation was funded by USAID/Madagascar; Mr. Rakotoary's participation was funded by USAID/AFR/SD. We are grateful to Ms. Lisa Gaylord, Environment and Rural Development Team Leader at USAID/Madagascar, who facilitated the participation of both Mr. Razafindretsa and Mr. Rakotoary.

The assessment was carried out in multiple stages. As a first step, two preliminary desk studies were prepared, one assessing Mali's EIA system and the other on issues and options for initiating an environmental management fund in Mali. These were then reviewed internally by the team and used to identify key questions and issues to address in stakeholder interviews and consultations during two weeks of field study in Mali. The studies were provided to EIA stakeholders in advance of the team's visit for comment, and to help structure interviews.

The team then visited Mali from 7–19 August 2006 for stakeholder consultations and information-gathering through meetings with representatives of key government departments, donors, and the private sector. A key part of the two-week visit was a one-day multi-stakeholder workshop to reach consensus on recommendations and ways forward with regard to both the EIA system and environmental funding. Hosted by MEA, this was the first such forum convened in Mali to discuss the EIA system.

The team's interim findings were presented to participants at a multi-stakeholder workshop, which generated consensus recommendations. Comments were solicited on the draft final report from USAID, MEA and US EPA. The final task report including findings and recommendations reflects these comments and feedback.

The final report was submitted to USAID and the MEA in November 2006.

### **TASK 3: DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF MENTORING PROGRAM**

A third component of this project involved organizing and delivering a mentoring program to support the MEA. US EPA staff worked with MEA staff to identify the thematic topics to be covered in the program. Two mentoring visits were organized in conjunction with Modules 3 and 4 of the training program. These allowed for more focused exchange between US EPA staff and the MEA on topics of specific interest to the MEA.

The first week of the mentoring program focused on the theme of public participation. The visit consisted of a series of meetings between the US EPA public participation expert, Diana Hammer, and MEA staff. In addition, two trainings were held on public participation with 31 participants from the Ministry. The visit resulted in the development of a memorandum offering a number of recommendations to the MEA.

The second week focused on the theme of environmental compliance and inspections, and included an intensive two-day course on this topic offered to MEA staff.

# PROGRAM RESULTS AND EVALUATION

## TASK 1: DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF TRAINING COURSES

Detailed course evaluations were submitted to USAID upon completion of each course.

The descriptions below provide a brief overview of each course from the perspective of the participants.

### MODULE 1: PRINCIPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The course provided a framework and principles for understanding how nations may define and design environmental impact assessment processes which can integrate environmental, economic and social objectives in project and program decision-making. Participants were asked to complete evaluations of each of the days' activities. They ranked each exercise on its organization, presentation, pertinence and utility. The average score for the overall course was 4.13 out of 5. Comments were generally positive regarding the importance of the course and the organization.

### MODULE 2: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FIELD PRACTICUM AND BIOTECHNOLOGY/BIOSAFETY TRAINING

#### 2A) FIELD PRACTICUM:

This course, based on the field component of the ENCAP EA-ESDM course delivered throughout Africa, provided participants with an opportunity to apply the skills acquired in the EIA Principles Course to real project activities. It was designed to give practitioners a practical grounding in field assessment of environmental impacts and the development of practical mitigation and monitoring strategies for implementation under environmental management plans.

The course consisted of site visits and group work. Participants were divided into three teams, each visiting a different set of sites on the first day. The second and third days were devoted to teams developing environmental impact assessment outlines and preparing environmental management (mitigation and monitoring) plan outlines based on case site experience.

Participants were asked to complete an evaluation of each of the days' activities. The average score for the overall course was 4.29 out of 5. More than half of the participants gave the field visits a score of 5.

#### 2B) BIOSAFETY AND BIOTECHNOLOGY TRAINING:

These are critical issues in many EIAs of agricultural development projects. This half-day training introduced basic concepts and issues, and discussed their treatment in the EIA process. Participants were asked to evaluate the course, and gave it an average score of 4.48 out of 5. More than half gave the course a grade of 5.

### MODULE 3: PRINCIPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REVIEW

#### 3A) PRINCIPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REVIEW

This course used case-study exercises to introduce students to fundamental elements involved in reviewing EIAs. Participants were asked to complete evaluations of each of the days' activities, and were invited to offer comments regarding whether the course gave them greater confidence and more competence in reviewing EIAs. The overall rating for the course was 4.16 out of 5, indicating that participants were well satisfied with what they had learned.

An open comment section of the evaluation offered some useful insights. All of the respondents stated that the course had given them greater confidence and competence. Answers ranged from the simple “yes”, to “incontestably, yes”. Participants’ comments on their professional capacity to apply the course materials were also encouraging. Comments included: “I think that from this moment forward, I can look at each project document with a critical eye regarding environmental evaluations”. Another comment read: « Vivre la solidarité entre le Mali et les États-Unis. Merci. »

### **3B) TRAINING OF TRAINERS**

This course was offered to 10 participants chosen by US EPA and the Malian MEA. It was originally expected to train 5 trainers. Due to popular demand, an additional 5 participants were trained. Participants were not asked to complete an evaluation as time was limited, but the interest in the course and resulting doubling of the number of course participants suggests that material was of interest to all of the participants.

## **MODULE 4, PRINCIPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT TRAINING**

The course provided participants with a framework and principles for understanding how regulatory agencies may design and establish environmental requirements and implement such requirements through compliance promotion, economic incentives, and enforcement programs. Participants were asked which parts of the course they liked the most, and which the least. They provided highly enthusiastic course evaluations. Most replied that their favorite part was the role-play negotiation session. Other strengths listed were the exercises dealing with promoting compliance, selecting management approaches, and responding to violations. As to the least favorite part, most replied that there was no weak part of the course they could single out. All the participants reported that the course materials were useful, both as a supplement to the training sessions and as a reference tool in their work. All replied that the course was highly applicable to their work. Several said that course stimulated new ideas and approaches for particular issues being dealt with at work.

## **MODULE 5: CLEANER PRODUCTION FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES**

This course was designed to build the capacity of Small and Medium Enterprises in Mali to use Cleaner Production (CP) tools and techniques, and to raise awareness and capacity within the enterprise business services and financing provider community in incorporating CP into their services as well.

An open course evaluation on the last day allowed participants to express their thoughts with respect to the course. They expressed satisfaction with the content of the course and the knowledge of CP gained, as well as the possibility of its application in their work. Anonymous written evaluations were also solicited. The average score for the overall course was 4.48 out of 5. The most common comment, received from more than half of the participants, was to increase the length of the course.

In addition, pre- and post-course tests were given to assess what participants learned. The pre-course tests demonstrated very little experience or understanding of cleaner production. By the end of the course participants had so much to write, that they had to be asked to stop.

## **TASK 2: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING GRM EIA PROCESSES AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS FOR THE INITIATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT FUND STUDY**

The study team found that Mali’s system exhibits a number of strengths and clearly embodies key principles of EIA effectiveness. However, the system does not function at a level of effectiveness sufficient to achieve its objectives. The goal of the assessment was to go beyond general descriptions of performance problems to diagnose specific impediments to system performance and make specific recommendations. Based on the team’s preliminary findings, a set of detailed recommendations were developed by participants in the multi-stakeholder workshop.

In brief, the team's final recommendations regarding EIA effectiveness included the following:

- While the ultimate institutional home for the EIA function is a contentious issue, all agree that this function must be “reinforced.”
- EIA is under-resourced and funding issues should be addressed.
- Revisions to the EIA decree are strongly indicated. (See box. Note that while an MEA task force may be responsible for technical preparation of proposals, official decision-making and consultation should be carried out via two existing mechanisms: the comité consultatif et le comité interministériel de gestion des questions environnementales).
- The development of a simplified procedure for small-scale or routine projects is essential.
- Environmental “cellules” in the line ministries are critical to effective environmental review and should be funded from core ministry budgets.
- “Linkages” between the EIA report and follow-through activities should be implemented. For example, EIA conditions need to be stated in a clearly auditable form and appended to the environmental license. The environmental audit decree (currently in draft) should require that audits specifically assess compliance with EIA conditions.
- A number of EIA tools should be developed. These include: sectorial guides; general guidance for EIA development, submission and implementation; EIA review guidance (for use by the inter-ministerial review committee); and an EIA tracking system to facilitate follow-up and enforcement. (Tools developed elsewhere in Africa can and should be adapted for use in Mali at a significant savings in resources, time and effort. Madagascar's ONE is an excellent first point of contact to obtain suitable models.)
- Human capacity for EIA should be further reinforced. The current project has undeniably improved EIA capacity in Mali's public, private and civil society sectors: as noted herein, training has constituted the largest part of the project. However, effective implementation of the EIA system will require significant capacity in local government, in line ministries, etc. Future capacity-building targeting these actors should directly address implementation of Mali's EIA system, as a logical follow on to the principles training undertaken by the current project.

In addition to assessing Mali's EIA system, the team was to assess the potential for initiating an EIA funding mechanism. While Mali's EIA system is already operational, no operational EIA funding mechanism (or general environmental funding mechanism) has yet been established. Further, the team found that the current level of understanding within the MEA is not sufficient to allow development of very detailed proposals for the design and operation of a new funding mechanism. As a result, the team outlined important issues and

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED EIA DECREE REVISIONS

### Revisions related to EIA procedures

In consultation with line ministries and other stakeholders, refine the criteria for projects subject to EIA, including criteria related to size, sector, and ecological context.

Define sensitive ecological zones. (This will also require technical input from ecologists and sociocultural experts.)

Establish streamlined EIA procedures for small-scale projects outside of sensitive ecological zones. (Alternately, or in addition, create « standard environmental permits » for common classes of smaller-scale activities. Each « standard permit » would specify simple environmental management practices sufficient to control the impacts of the activity in question. In normal circumstances, activities in these classes would not be subject to an EIA process.)

Better define public participation procedures consistent with standards of good practice.

Better define the sanction and appeal procedures, consistent with standards of good practice.

Make clear that EIA conditions should be rendered in auditable form, and that this « cahier de charges environnementales » shall be physically attached to the environmental permit.

### Revisions related to financing.

The decree should be revised to include EIA fees, assessed on a sliding scale based on the total capital investment represented by the project. (Separate decree/statutes will be required to be enacted to operationalize the funding mechanism to which the fees contribute.)

options, key characteristics and features a new funding mechanism should exhibit, and next steps to be taken to establish such a mechanism.

These are organized around four inter-related, basic issues that must be addressed in the design of a funding mechanism or assessment of funding options: funding needs, the niche of the mechanism, sources of revenues, and institutional arrangements.

In the recommendations presented in this report, MEA has a detailed agenda for improvement of Mali's EIA system and its funding—and potentially for improving funding of environmental management activities more broadly.

## **TASK 3: DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF MENTORING PROGRAM**

Detailed descriptions and evaluations of the mentoring visits were submitted to USAID in the trip reports submitted upon completion of each week of mentoring. The following gives a brief overview of the result of each visit.

### **MENTORING WEEK 1**

As indicated, the first week of the mentoring program focused on the theme of public participation. US EPA public participation expert, Diana Hammer, spent a week working closely with MEA staff. The week of mentoring consisted of a series of meetings and trainings, and resulted in the development of a memorandum offering a number of recommendations that were submitted to MEA and to USAID in a trip report.

Two separate trainings on public participation were held. The MEA invited 31 of its staff to participate. Topics included: Who pays for public participation? Who conducts it? How is public participation facilitated? What happens during the 45 and 30 day public comment periods? How does participation in public vs. private projects differ? How is public participation conducted on regional projects? Concerns over adequate staff and funding. When should the public first be consulted? What are the specific actions that need to be taken to make public participation effective?; etc.

Participants were fully engaged in discussions about the draft Mali regulation on public participation. As a result of those discussions, the draft language was to be completely rewritten.

Some of the concerns voiced included that the State lacks the proper training for facilitating effective public participation. It was recognized that facilitators should understand how to ask questions, how to facilitate meetings, how to choose appropriate methods for conveying and receiving information, how to choose appropriate fora (open house, workshop, etc), how to create a trusting environment, etc. In addition, participants voiced the concern that the facilitation of public participation by state representatives may inhibit or bias responses. It was suggested that an unbiased third party help facilitate participation. It was also suggested that sufficient resources need to be made available to effectively carry out public participation. This might involve basic resources such as arranging transportation and per-diem to encourage participation. Finally, participants suggested that advocacy training for “civil society” may be needed to encourage civil society participation in the process.

### **MENTORING WEEK 2**

The second week of mentoring focused on the theme of environmental compliance and inspection. US EPA staff, Amelia Katzen and Jamey Watt offered a two day course on Environmental Compliance Inspection for 18 participants from the Ministry of the Environment so that they could better understand guiding principles on monitoring compliance with environmental requirements. Background on the underlying principles governing compliance and enforcement of environmental requirements was provided, followed by specific procedures to be followed in collecting evidence, conducting inspections, sampling and analysis, and documenting inspections.



# CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The training and the mentoring program were extremely well received by the MEA. A core cadre of approximately 20 MEA staff professionals participated in the entire series of EIA specific courses (Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment Field Practicum, Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment Review, and Elements of Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Training). Ten participants were also trained as EIA trainers. In addition, representatives from both the MEA and private sector benefited from the Cleaner Production for Small and Medium Enterprises course. As a result of the training courses, the MEA staff now includes a cadre of newly trained professionals.

Through the mentoring program, the MEA established a strong working relationship with the US EPA. Two MEA officials, Dr. Moulaye Farota and Adama Sidibe, worked closely with the US EPA in developing the mentoring programs. Not only did MEA staff benefit from the workshops conducted as part of these visits, but the relationship between the US EPA and the MEA was strengthened, thus allowing for potential future collaboration.

In addition, as a result of the EIA/Environmental Management Fund study team's contribution to this project, the MEA now possesses a detailed agenda for improving Mali's EIA system and its funding—and potentially, funding of environmental management activities more broadly.

At a minimum, implementing this suggested agenda for improving the EIA system and its funding will require cooperative efforts and active participation of the stakeholders in the EIA system; two existing mechanisms should be utilized for this purpose: the comité consultatif and the comité inter-ministériel de gestion des questions environnementales.

While not all the proposed changes and actions recommended are resource-intensive, the team strongly believes that donor funding for a program supporting these recommendations will result in faster progress, and will allow the more difficult and resource-intensive issues to be properly addressed. It is suggested that a donor-funded program be designed and implemented in the near future to take advantage of the momentum and moment of opportunity created by the current project.

The team was not tasked with developing a detailed scope of work for a follow-up program. However, it did develop an initial assessment of the technical resources and process required to implement its suggested recommendations. This is detailed in the complete study. The basic approach of the recommended program would involve carrying out three principal types of activities: (1) technical assistance to MEA to develop key EIA tools and systems; (2) EIA capacity-building, targeting local government and environmental cellules in the line ministries; and (3) facilitation/technical support to a multi-stakeholder process to develop revisions to the EIA decree, and more significantly, a detailed proposal for an environmental funding mechanism.

Making even well-resourced EIA systems effective requires political will and commitment. Thus, an effective follow-up program will require high-level commitment from the government of Mali. The team identified the following government actions and commitments as essential preconditions for a donor-funded follow-up program.

- Staff environmental cellules in the line ministries. Staff costs for these cellules should be borne by the central government budget; donor funding could support their start-up costs.
- Commitment to an EIA fee system and EIA decree changes.

- Initiate straightforward improvements to the EIA system. As an indication of its commitment, MEA can and should initiate the most basic and straightforward revisions to the EIA process outlined in this report before future projects are funded and implemented. These include implementing "auditable" environmental licenses, with EIA conditions appended.

By providing the MEA with recommendations for improving the EIA system, while also training a cadre of EIA professionals, this project has placed the MEA in a position to vastly improve its capacity for managing EIA processes.



# ANNEX I: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

## KEY:

Module #	Training Session
1	Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment
2	Environmental Impact Assessment Field Assessment
Biotech	Biotechnology and Biosafety
3	Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment Review
ToT	Training of Trainers
4	Principles of Environmental Compliance and Enforcement
5	Cleaner Production for Small and Medium Enterprises

## Participants

Last Name	First Name	Association	Training Session						
			1	2	BioTech	3	ToT	4	5
Bagayogo	Amadou	DNPC	x	x	x	x		x	
Bah	Abdramane	DNACPN	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Barry	Moussa	DNCN	x	x	x				
Camara	Kasse	DNU	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Camara	Zakaria	MA DNA	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Coulibaly	Moutian	DRACPN							x
Coulibaly	Tiecoura	DNPIA	x	x	x	x			
Dembele	Mariam Sissoko	ABFN						x	
Deme	Moussa	DRACPN							x
Diallo	Arby Aminata	Ministere Sante	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Diallo	Modibo	DNACPN							x
Diallo	Oumar	DNACPN							x
Diarra	Nouhoum	G Force Segou							x
Diarra	Ousmane	DNU	x	x	x	x			
Diarra Keita	Tata	APCAM							x
Dicko	Aoua	ONG SABA						x	x
Dione	Elie	MA DNA	x	x	x	x		x	
Doumbia	Moussa	ANSSA							x
Guindo	Souleymane	DRACPN	x	x	x	x	x		
Guisse	Abou	DNGM						x	
Keita	Bakary Issa	CCIM							x
Keita	Namory	DRCN	x	x	x			x	
Konate	Mariam Sissoko	ESKOM				x	x		
Konate	Moussa	DNUH				x			
Kone	Assita	Aicha Nono						x	x
Macina	Mamadou	ABFN	x	x	x				

Last Name	First Name	Association	Training Session						
			1	2	BioTech	3	ToT	4	5
Mariko	Djicoura	DNPIA							x
Niare	Titi	DRCN	x	x	x				
Outtara	Fatoumata	Aviculture Sikasso							x
Samake	Modibo	DRACPN	x	x	x	x		x	x
Samake	Sayon	COPRAV							x
Sanogo	Yacouba	CEMAPI							x
Sanou	Ibrahim	Huilerie Bah Mariama							x
Sidibe	Adama	MEA/CAB	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sidibe	Cheickne	DNACPN				x			
Sidibe	Djibril	CPS Industries	x	x	x	x			
Sidibe	Hamadoun	DNCN						x	
Sissoko	Gustave Alexandre	MMEE	x	x	x				
Sissoko	Idrissa	MEP	x	x	x	x	x		
Sissoko	Korotoumou	DRACPN				x		x	
Sogore	Ousmane	DNACPN	x	x	x	x		x	
Soumaguel	Abdouramane	ABFN	x	x	x	x		x	
Sow	Djeneba	Danaya Cereales							x
Sow	Modibo	Rizeri Segou							x
Tamboura	Yacouba	DRACPN						x	x
Telly	Salif	Tannerie de Segou							x
Thiam	Cheick Mohamed	STP	x	x	x	x		x	
Thiero	Mamadou	Thiero Business Provider							x
Timbo	Bokary	Ministere Agriculture							x
Togola	Salia	Kene Aliments Volailles							x
Traore	Abdoulaye	STP	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Traore	Idrissa	DN Industries	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Traore	Zandjoukou	Sukala							x
Traore	Zoumana	Comatex	x	x	x	x			x